LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

Britain's Hour
R.P.D.

Africa, Africa!
DEREK KARTUN

Does Peace Mean Slump?
JOHN EATON

June, 1953

One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAINTING IT RED

ONE hundred years ago a man was born who would point to a map of Africa and say: 'That is my dream—all red!' The prospects are bright of that becoming true—in a very different sense from which he meant it. This is the centenary year of the birth of Cecil Rhodes, the millionaire, grandiose land-robber, cattle-stealer and empire-builder, who declared: 'I would annex the planets if I could. I often think of it.' (Indeed, they make films about that very dream in Hollywood today.) He set the pace and pattern which we recognise in the headlines daily: Rhodes, the man who had a field of maize in Pondoland mowed down by machine guns and told the Chief: 'That is what will happen to you and your tribe if you give us any further trouble.' True, Rhodes had no dive-bombers at his disposal. But we have not far to seek for present-day imitators of the man who rebuked the police officer who spared surrendering warriors, by saying: 'You should kill all you can, as it serves as a lesson to them when they talk things over at their fires at night.' Nor is the type so unfamiliar today who holds fantastic ideas of the 'Anglo-Saxon' race like Rhodes, who was ready 'to accept the reunion of the Race under the Stars and Stripes if it could not be obtained in any other way'. True, Rhodes was no Knight of the Garter; merely a Privy Councillor and Premier of Cape Colony. Today there are many true sons of Rhodes (that he was unmarried does not alter the case). But although Rhodes and his spiritual offspring seem alike in their actions, 1953 finds it a very different world from the 'Eighties. These are not today the heirs of Africa. Even the least civilised Kenya white settler can see that those who will inherit the vast continent are the millions of its inhabitants; among them the Matabeles from whom Rhodes not only stole their land, but its very name—to call it Rhodesia. Today the sons of Rhodes 'the Dreamer' have become subject to nightmare. If some seventy years ago the African tribes were robbed, cozened and murdered piecemeal and could not then resist defeat, today the picture is a very different one. Witness the splendid article by Derek Kartun, *Africa, Africa!* which we print on page 252. There is another side of the picture: a crime has been committed against the British people. For Rhodes and his patrons here had little difficulty then in cozening the British working class and their children with lies about the civilising mission of the Empire-Builders. Yet despite the school history books and the servile press, today we too are slowly learning the lesson of resistance to lies and deception. Witness a letter from a *Labour Monthly* reader who is a Serviceman in—well, give it the right name, Matabeleland. He writes: 'When I first arrived here, eighteen months ago, I felt embittered by the way in which the native population was being degraded. Now I realise that bitterness is not enough, and only by giving support—financial and otherwise—to the progressive movement can we hope to play a part in changing the present set-up.' With this he sends 5s. from his pay. The puny 'Great Dreamer' Rhodes might well writhe in his grave under his grandiose monument, and mutter again his dying words: 'So little done, so much to do.' For Africa is passing him by, the colour of the vast continent is indeed changing—and so is the understanding of our young people at home. It takes more than two days of Coronation pomp and circumstance (at the cost of £1,000,000 a day from the tax-payer's pocket) to whitewash and putty up the cracks in the 'dolorous mansion' of Empire. Recall these words:

(*Continued on page iii of cover*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXV, No. 6 CONTENTS June, 1953

Page

NOTES OF THE MONTH: Britain's Hour, by R.P.D. 241
AFRICA, AFRICA! by Derek Kartun 252
ON THE RAZOR'S EDGE, by Ivor Montagu 258
DOES PEACE MEAN SLUMP? by John Eaton 262
AN OLD SUPERSTITION, A NEW DISGRACE, by William Morris 271
CHURCHES IN EASTERN EUROPE, by Rev. Stanley Evans 274
THE OLD BLUNDERER: History of *The Times*, by R. Palme Dutt .. 279
FROM THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC 264-5
TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO 257

Book Reviews:

China's New Creative Age, by Hewlett Johnson: *Monica Felton* .. 283
Koje Unscreened by W. Burchett & A. Winnington: *D. N. Pritt, Q.C.* 284
The Revolutionary Movement in France, by J. Plamenatz: *H.R.J.* .. 286

Notes of the Month

Britain's Hour

'The more sober-minded and progressive politicians in the European and other capitalist countries, those who are not blinded by anti-Soviet enmity, distinctly see the abyss into which the reckless American adventurers are dragging them; and they are beginning to come out against war. . . . If they take this new path, European and other countries will meet with the complete understanding on the part of all the peace-loving countries.'

G. MALENKOV, Report to the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, October, 1952.

***'One should not assume that all the troubles in the world are due to* Communist initiative. . . . There are elements in the United States that do not want a settlement. . . . I am certain that, still, Great Britain has the power and the will to give a lead for peace.'**

C. R. ATTLEE, House of Commons, May 12, 1953.

AT last a beginning has been made. Fifteen months have passed since Stalin's far-sighted prediction in February, 1952, that 'capitalist Britain, and, after her, capitalist France, will be compelled in the end to break from the embrace of the U.S.A.' and 'endeavour to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.' The speeches of Sir Winston

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Churchill on May 11 and of Mr. Attlee on May 12 represent an important landmark in the evolution of British policy. For the first time since the war British official policy has taken an independent initiative, however limited, however hedged with qualifications, but without waiting for the United States, without the permission of the United States, and even to the obvious displeasure of United States' official expression, in the direction of peace.

After Seven Years

Seven years have passed since the Fulton programme of the Anglo-American 'cold war'. After seven years the Fulton programme begins to receive its answer from the Author of Fulton. The great peace initiative of the Soviet, Chinese and Korean Governments is winning a response. Britain, the Soviet Union and China all now stand for a speedy meeting of the Powers for peace. This is a signal initial victory for the world peace campaign. It opens the gates to a new world situation. It is bound to have far-reaching repercussions within the United States; for the noisy clamour of bellicose senators by no means expresses American popular opinion (a Gallup poll in the United States in April showed 78 per cent. for a meeting of Eisenhower, Churchill and Malenkov). There are a hundred snags and dangers in the path. The war camp is striving with renewed intensity to wreck the Korean peace negotiations, and may still launch some sudden reckless violent adventure in order to kill the hopes of peace before they reach fruition. The British tentative move is still weak, hesitant, recoiling before the blast of American storm pressure. Hence the present situation calls for more urgent response, not less. But the decisive battle for peace has opened. The stakes involved are not only peace, but the national independence of Britain. By popular unity and action this battle can be fought and won.

Signs of Change

It is only a beginning. But it is a beginning, and it has been received with a universal national welcome. Distant now are the days of the Fulton *pronunciamento,* with its advocacy of what Mr. Bevin called a 'preventive war' ('As I understood the Fulton speech, it was a preventive war which Mr. Churchill had in mind', Ernest Bevin in the House of Commons, March 28, 1950). Distant equally are the days of 'Cards on the Table' with its cynical apologia for servitude to the American military alliance against the Soviet Union:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> The gibe that America provides the money while we provide the men is simply answered—for that suits us better than providing both the men and the money.
>
> *Cards on the Table: An Interpretation of Labour's Foreign Policy,* published by the Labour Party, May, 1947.

Such a sentiment, characteristic of the days of Bevin, would sound oddly in the ears of most Labour supporters today. The sense of national respect is stirring anew. To be the paid military retainers of a foreign Power is no longer regarded as the highest destiny for the British nation in the modern world. A new and healthier wind is blowing.

Beyond Munichism

Harsh experience of the intervening years has taught many lessons. The New Munichism of the post-war years has begun to approach its bankruptcy, as the Old Munichism did on the eve of the war. The old shibboleths of would-be 'hard-boiled realism' in defence of tying Britain to American aggressive economic and military policies and in denunciation of the Soviet Union as the main enemy and source of all evil have not yet vanished from the scene. They are still trotted out in all their glory in the foreign policy pamphlet entitled *Socialism and Foreign Policy,* by the extreme right-wing Labour group, Socialist Union—ironically published the day after Mr. Attlee's speech. But the obvious inappositeness of this publication at this moment illustrates the change in atmosphere. It is left to the handful of Noel-Baker Die-Hards to conduct their rearguard action and to warn a Churchill against the 'risks' of a meeting of the Powers. But the speech of Mr. Attlee the next day corrected the negative attitude of the previous Noel-Baker speech, and set out in its positive immediate proposals (Korean truce, China, German unity and freedom of decision, relations with the United States, trade and extension of non-dollar trade, and support for a speedy meeting of the leading Powers) the first approach towards a current fighting platform on foreign policy which could win united support from the Labour movement. There is no doubt that the Labour Party Executive statement on foreign policy has been wisely held over, and will need to be recast in the light of Mr. Attlee's speech and the new developments.

No Time to Lose

The battle has opened; but the victory has still to be won. The memory of the first half of 1939, when the disastrous outcome of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Munichism lay exposed and discredited in the sight of all, but the indispensable decisive change to an alternative policy was fatally hampered and delayed by sabotage on top, has its important bearing for today. It is a timely warning reminder of the need of speed, if the present opportunity is not to be lost. Experience has now taught to the widest sections of all parties and of the whole people the costs and burdens of the old policy. Experience has taught that the heaviest shattering blows of the old 'cold war' programme, rearmament and trade bans, have fallen, not on the economy of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, but on the economy of Britain. Experience has taught that the relentless drive of economic, political and military penetration and expansion into Britain and the countries of the Empire has arisen, not from the Soviet Union, but from the State Department, Wall Street and the Pentagon. Experience has taught that the manifest menace of war and the open calls to reckless aggressive military policies arise, not from the Soviet Union, but from powerful military and business circles in the United States, where the prospect of peace is publicly discussed as a spectre. All this practical experience has helped to prepare the way for an unmistakable re-orientation of public opinion and a readiness for new policies; and this has received its first stage of expression also on the highest official levels.

Hour of Opportunity

Britain's hour of opportunity is here. It is in the light of concrete experience and concrete needs that the great body of national opinion has begun to move, and has responded with enthusiasm to the speeches for peace and a meeting of the powers from the leaders of the Government and the Opposition. There is pride in the realisation that Britain need not be for ever an impotent and despised satellite, but can play an independent and even decisive part in world affairs for peace. As the real forces for war and for peace in the world begin to be recognised, there develops a widespread change in the attitude to the Soviet Union (euphemistically described as the 'change' in Soviet policy). The peace initiatives of the Soviet Union and China, which previously used to be automatically dismissed as 'peace offensives 'and 'peace manoeuvres', are now treated with respect and meet with response. The old premisses and programme (N.A.T.O., E.D.C., etc.) are still assumed in the speeches of both leaders. But what is important is not what is old, but what is new. There is a new shift in the whole approach. It is for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressure of the entire nation to see that this shift shall be carried forward to a decisive advance in policy for peace and for the national independence of Britain.

United States and Britain

What has led to this significant change, not only in public opinion, but also in the immediate strategy of British official policy? There is no doubt that the immediate driving impetus has been the sharpening conflict of interests between United States and British policy, especially since the advent of the Republicans to power, President Eisenhower's threats of extending the war in the Far East (which led to the first public storm this year in Anglo-American relations), the speeches of Dulles and his rôle in the Middle East, the failure of the Eden-Butler Mission, and the hardening of American economic policy in relation to Britain's trade needs. The arrival of Dulles in Egypt, the bellicose speeches of Neguib, obviously directed, not merely to Egyptian national opinion, but also to the hope of American approval, and the provocative gift by President Eisenhower of a revolver to Neguib, immediately preceded and may have helped to precipitate the Churchill speech, with its simultaneous co-operative response to Soviet peace moves, courting of Israel and ferocious diatribe against Neguib. This does not mean, however, that the speech should be regarded merely as a form of pressure on the United States; the issues are too large for this.

Mr. Butler's Warning

It should be noted that the speech of Mr. Butler on May 8 preceded that of Sir Winston Churchill, and already cast the warning light ahead on the developing storm in Anglo-American relations. The Chancellor of the Exchequer's speech followed on the rejection by the United States of the Butler plan, which had been initiated at the Dominion Premiers' Conference and submitted for American approval. Mr. Butler had previously in his Budget speech stressed the crippling burdens which Britain had to carry as a result of its existing foreign policy and commitments:

> He knew of no period in British history when the overseas liabilities of the British people, particularly in defence, were greater than they were today, nor of any period in which a nation of our size had undertaken such large international liabilities and so large a defence programme.

On May 8 he cast the spotlight directly on the responsibility of the United States. He declared that Britain's recovery was 'thwarted by politics on the other side of the Atlantic' and that 'the fault is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as much on that side as on this'. In the form of a re-assertion of fidelity to the alliance he declared that 'it would be a great mistake to go back on the objective of closer working with the American economy'—thereby raising for the first time in an official expression the consideration of the possibility of an alternative policy.

Mr. Attlee and Senator McCarthy

Mr. Attlee in his speech of May 12 carried forward the Churchill opening, not only in the greater concreteness of many policy suggestions, but especially in bringing into the light of day many of the burning issues of Anglo-American contradiction with a degree of frankness which would not have been possible from the Head of a Government, but which received no dissent in the Government reply. The immediate fury of expression from the war camp in the United States, which followed the Churchill-Attlee declarations, was in consequence especially turned upon 'Comrade Attlee'. In the eyes of Senator McCarthy Mr. Attlee became a crypto-Communist traitor and agent of the Kremlin who had infiltrated into Transport House—an interesting turning of the tables on the customary Transport House right-wing propaganda against the left in the Labour movement, from which useful lessons can be drawn. The British press in reply has dealt with considerable candour with the phenomenon of 'McCarthyism' in the United States. This chorus on both sides of the Atlantic constituted the musical accompaniment to the graver issues of President Eisenhower's rejection of the Churchill proposal for a meeting of the Powers (under cover of demanding first 'concrete acts' from the Soviet Union, when the whole world is looking for concrete acts from the United States) and General Harrison's wrecking tactics in the Korean truce negotiations. The fight for peace is thus inextricably bound up, not only with the crucial question of the relations of Britain and the Soviet Union, and of the United States and the Soviet Union, but also of Britain and the United States.

For Anglo-American Co-operation for Peace

In view of the present storm in official Anglo-American relations, it is essential to establish with the fullest clearness the viewpoint of those who support peace and co-operation of the Powers. Such a policy requires as its essential foundation Anglo-Soviet-American co-operation and harmony, ensuring the co-operation of the five permanent Powers which can alone make effective the functioning

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the United Nations in accordance with the terms and intentions of the Charter. So far from having an interest in Anglo-American division or 'gloating over' Anglo-American division, as critics falsely allege, supporters of peace are striving to promote Anglo-American co-operation on the only basis on which it can be stable and fruitful —for peace. What they are opposing is the method of the sectional military alliance which seeks by superior armed force to dictate and impose its will upon the world and to distort the United Nations from an organ of co-operation and peace into the instrument of the armed policy of a sectional grouping of Powers. The present storm in official Anglo-American relations is not necessarily a sign of a worsening international situation or increasing war tension. On the contrary, it is a symptom and reflection of the development of moves for peace. Those who seek to deplore the rifts and paper over the cracks are not necessarily serving the cause of peace. On the contrary, they are in most cases only seeking to conceal the real contradictions which need to be faced, and to cement a sectional military alliance whose operation is entirely contrary to the spirit of the United Nations and of peace. The fight against the domination of the aggressive military clique in the United States and their satellites in Britain is an essential step forward in order to bring closer the real co-operation of the British and American peoples for peace.

'Pro-American' and 'Anti-American'

When supporters of peace and critics of the war policy are dubbed 'anti-American', this is not only a stupid calumny and travesty of the truth. It is also an exact reversal of the facts. As soon as Mr. Attlee utters sentiments in favour of peace and a meeting of the Powers, and criticises extreme militarist reaction and monopolist high protectionism in the United States, he also is roundly denounced as 'anti-American'. 'Anti' what America? Are the supporters of peace and advocates of a Three Power meeting opposed to the 78 per cent. of the American population who, according to the latest Gallup poll, are supporting precisely this demand, but are virtually debarred from expression on official levels. On the contrary, the so-called 'anti-Americans' are expressing the desires of four out of five Americans, the vast majority who have always opposed the Korean War and demanded their troops home, in every newspaper poll; who only voted for Eisenhower because he promised to end the hated Korean War of Truman and bring the troops home; and who have always supported overwhelmingly every proposal for ending the 'cold war' and for a meeting of the Heads of States. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so-called 'anti-Americans', in expressing thus the desires of four out of five Americans, are giving them a voice and medium of expression which is effectively denied to them through virtually all official organs of expression and representation within the United States. The fight is not against the American people, but against the handful of the top militarist and big monopolist clique and their hangers-on in Britain who are equally the enemies of the American and British peoples. The victory of this fight is the indispensable condition, not only for peace and for the national independence of Britain, but also for overcoming Anglo-American division and conflict and promoting the friendship and co-operation of the American and British peoples.

Reflections for Mr. Attlee

For Mr. Attlee, especially, there should be some food for thought in the present experience. As soon as he has come out with some very mild sentiments for peace and international co-operation, and some very restrained criticism of certain excesses of bellicose policy in the United States, he is violently denounced and proclaimed (1) 'anti-American' (2) a 'Communist' or 'crypto-Communist', with some references to 'treason', subordination to a foreign power, and obedience to the Kremlin. Is there not something familiar in all this? Have we not read it all before somewhere? Yes, in the literature of Transport House, published under the auspices of Mr. Attlee, when it has been a question of dealing with left critics and peace supporters in the Labour movement. It is of course a characteristic irony of the Comic Muse of History that the Grand High Purger of alleged Communists, Communist sympathisers or associates or Peace supporters in the Labour Party should now be threatened with the long arm of the McCarthy purge for the same offence. But it is also a familiar irony of the historical record, long ago demonstrated in the case of the German Social Democratic leaders, who refused a united front with the Communists against Hitler, and imagined themselves safe in voting for Hitler in the Reichstag while the terror struck down the Communists, only to find their turn came next. Cannot the lesson be learned this time before it is too late?

The United Front

The Spanish Republican cause for which you upheld a clenched fist in those days, Mr. Attlee, and rightly defend it now as justified,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was the cause of a *united front* of Communists and Social Democrats fighting reaction and maintaining a common government. Has what was right then become wrong now? Is the menace vanished today? Is Adenauer so remote from Stresemann and Von Papen? Is McCarthy so remote from Goebbels? Are not the Nazi generals being armed anew? Have the Krupps and the Thyssens received back their scores of millions of pounds in order to make toys? Is it not time, Mr. Attlee, that you stopped expelling honest members of the Labour Party, including pioneers and veterans and founders of the Labour Party, who were building the Labour Party long before you had begun to move from Toryism, for the crime of attending a Peace Congress, and called them back to take the honoured place they deserve in the ranks of their party? Does not the present situation call aloud for unity in action, alike in Britain and internationally, for peace and the needs of the people against the mad dogs of war and reaction? For assuredly today also 'it is later than you think'.

Lesson of Sunderland

There is an inescapable political lesson in the outcome of the Sunderland by-election at this juncture, whose significance goes beyond the normal zealous barometer-reading of the day-to-day electoral switchback. The Labour Government used to boast of a unique record that it had never lost a seat in any by-election during its tenure as a Government. But it was not able to claim that it had ever gained a seat from the Opposition. It appears that the last time this feat was accomplished was close on thirty years ago. Thus it is a sufficiently unusual political phenomenon to be worthy of special attention. The intervention of the Liberal candidate should have probably served, according to general estimation, to split off a section of the Tory vote and assist Labour rather than otherwise. Further, this by-election took place immediately after the municipal elections had revealed a considerable series of Labour gains and Tory defeats. What had happened in between? There is no dispute in any quarter as to the decisive event that happened in between. On May 7 the municipal elections took place, with the Labour gains. On May 11 came the Churchill speech holding out the hope of a speedy initiative for peace and a meeting of the Powers. On May 13 Sunderland polled. As in the general election, so in the Sunderland by-election peace swung the election. There is a lesson for the Labour Party in this.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Labour Programme

At the present moment the new Draft Programme of the Labour Party Executive, which has been so long incubating, is due to be published. It is stated that the programme will be published in two parts or in the shape of two successive documents, one dealing with home policy and the other with international affairs. In the present situation of Britain, and in the face of the present problems confronting Britain, such a separation is in fact impossible. The practicability of a positive progressive policy at home is entirely dependent on a policy for peace, national independence, the reduction of strangling military commitments and overseas military adventures, and the extension of trade with the economically advancing non-dollar socialist world. Plenty of speculations and controversies have already appeared on the contents of the draft programme. One thing can be said with certainty in advance. The draft programme will be born dead if it fails to present in the forefront a positive and concrete policy for peace, for the national independence of Britain from American domination, for the reduction of military commitments, and the extension of East-West trade as the indispensable basis for economic and social advance at home. For if it fails to do this, its home programme can only present a grim and gloomy prospect of tightened belts, sacrificed social advances, and economic suicide masquerading in the guise of 'economic realism'.

First Things First

The present battle determines the future. Peace in Korea has not yet been won. The cease-fire in Korea is the obvious first necessity in order to advance to a programme of settlement by negotiation. Nazi rearmament is still the official policy of the Government. Military operations in Malaya and Kenya continue. Britain is staggering under an arms burden without parallel in peace-time. Trade figures are falling. The Prime Minister has made a gesture in favour of a speedy meeting of the Powers for peace, and it has been supplemented by the Leader of the Opposition. But it is so far only a gesture. The seed may fall on stony ground. It has been warmly welcomed in other countries in Europe and Asia, as notably in the reception by Premier Nehru. It has met with a frigid official reception in the United States, and with unconcealed hostility by the more vocal bellicose sections. Nor is resistance lacking in certain circles in this country, as shown by the Montgomerys and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ismays, the Noel-Bakers, Bellengers and Daines. The battle cannot be won without a fight. So far no overt governmental action, no direct invitation to a conference, no public and decisive stand for a speedy cease-fire in Korea and for a Far Eastern settlement has yet been taken. There is every danger of surrender to the pressure of the war camp in the United States and its allies in this country. Only the fullest mobilisation of popular opinion and pressure can carry forward the initial gestures of May 11 and 12 to further stages of action. This is the supreme responsibility of the entire Labour movement and the peace movement at the present stage. Let Mr. Attlee's speech of May 12 be made a starting point. Let the united strength of the Labour movement be thrown into action to rally the entire nation for peace and national independence, for Britain's trading freedom and the needs of the people. There can be no doubt of the response which such a campaign would arouse. The success of such a campaign would not only respond to present urgency. It would ensure electoral victory and open the way to a new political future for the solution of Britain's problems.

May 18, 1953. R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; $3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada ($3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AFRICA, AFRICA!

DEREK KARTUN

IT was Burke who said that a populace never rebels from passion for attack, but from impatience of suffering. Looking at Africa today, the Government and the Press say otherwise. It is not easy to estimate just how much sheer misery people are expected to endure before they earn themselves the right to stand upon their feet and cry cease. But if there's some level of oppression, injustice and suffering at which men acquire the right to strike out at their tormentors, then the people of Africa reached that point long ago, and passed it.

One hundred million Africans were sold into slavery. Whole civilisations were destroyed. Peoples once healthy, prolific and cultured were reduced to diseased inertia and starvation. Untold wealth was sucked out of the continent. Millions of acres were stolen from the African and given to the European. At the same time, enough roads were built to ensure military and commercial communications. Enough health services were established to ensure the survival of the white man. Enough education was permitted to provide the skilled labour force that colonisation required. What else has been introduced—and it has been little enough in all conscience—was in the way of insurance against revolt.

For these things Africans are expected to be grateful. Men who try to keep their families alive on four shillings a week are reproved, by five-thousand-a-year Ministers of the Crown for their ingratitude. The Africans are told Britain is in Africa (like France, Belgium and the rest) upon a civilising mission bent—disinterested, devoted and quite reluctant, at bottom, to stay. They say that; and then they say things like this:

> Through the almost inevitable evolution of the world, Great Britain's economy has suffered set-back after set-back, and it is difficult to see how anything like the present standard of living can be maintained unless new sources of raw materials and favourable markets are found to replace those which we have lost. . . . Africa holds out one of the few solutions, provided that affairs in the Continent are handled wisely and with a practical sense of urgency.

That is the voice of General de Guingand in the *Sunday Times*. We begin to see contradictions in what is said about Africa. And the contradictions thicken in the columns of the financial press, where

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

City interests are willing enough to indicate that the reason for their interest in Africa is that the place is still highly profitable.

It always was, of course. But with the virtual loss of Britain's Asian possessions—with the general shrinking of the areas of the world available for colonial exploitation—Africa steadily becomes relatively more important. It becomes the main single source of colonial plunder and it becomes a vast rear base of imperialism—the last place where monopolists of the Western Powers can do as they please—dig gold and copper, grow coffee and sisal, export cocoa and palm oil, build airfields and bases—without interference and dirt cheap. Or can they?

If Africa is so overwhelmingly important for imperialism, the liberation of Africa must logically be equally important for anti-imperialism, for the common cause of the world's common people. Thus it is that the arrival of the peoples of Africa in the very vanguard of the struggle for liberation is a political fact of historic and world-wide importance. It would be difficult to overestimate its significance. Consider: within the very heart of imperialism's last great base, always regarded as inviolate, unshakable and safe, a determined and widely-varying struggle for freedom of continent-wide scope has come into being, and has already demonstrated that it cannot be crushed by the traditional methods of repression, nor diverted by the newer methods of political fraud. Once one has grasped the dimensions of that historic fact, some most important conclusions become inescapable for the people of this country. First a word on the struggle itself.

Burke said 'impatience of suffering'. Take one example alone, and from one of the least poverty-stricken parts of the whole Continent. In 1951 a team of British social and medical experts surveyed a richer-than-average village in the Gold Coast. They found that after 105 years of British rule only six children were attending school (three miles away), only 87 of the last 162 babies born in the village had survived beyond their first birthday, one half of the children were suffering from malnutrition, the water supply was filthy, there was no sanitation, and malaria was universal.

This village lived by growing cocoa. Now consider the economics of Gold Coast cocoa. The Cocoa Boards of Nigeria and the Gold Coast have a total monopoly of the purchase and marketing of the crop. In the 1947-48 season the Boards paid £20 millions to the farmers for the entire crop and sold it for £56 millions. Net profit for the year was £33 millions. In 1948-49 there were difficulties and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they made no profit. In 1949-50 they made £24 millions, and in 1950-51 they made £35 millions. Thus, close to one hundred million pounds were squeezed out of the villages of West Africa for one crop alone in four years. And medical experts find half the children dying before they reach their first birthday.

Multiply that picture, sharpen it for the even poorer areas, vary it in the sweated-labour mines and industries of the Centre and the South, and you have Africa as the African endures it.

So he rises to his feet and demands a better life: a house instead of a shack, a school for his children, medicines, enough to eat, a union, a vote, a place in his own African sun. And this protest, sweeping the Continent from Lagos eastwards to Nairobi and from Tunis south to the Cape, takes many forms. In Kenya it took legal, traditional forms. The Kenya Africa Union is a broad political organisation, seeking to use the traditional forms of struggle—demonstrations, agitation, petitions, the demand for the vote. The young working class, as elsewhere in Africa, organised its unions and placed itself in the forefront of the struggle. So the settlers smash the unions and exile their leaders, beat up peaceful picket lines and pass crippling anti-labour legislation; then they go after the leaders of the Kenya Africa Union with charges of organising violence.

What happens? There *is* violence. People are killed. Secret organisations operate where mass organisations are prevented from operating. But to those who are hasty to denounce Mau Mau, it is perhaps possible to say: what of the hundred million slaves? what of the children who die before their first birthday? what of the earlier massacres in East Africa, which you may forget because they did not happen to your people, but which the East Africans may conceivably be forgiven for remembering. How much suffering must a people take—how many unjust judges and brutalised policemen, how much slum and disease—before they earn the right to strike back?

And since we talk of violence, let us talk of all kinds of violence. Mr. Lyttelton admitted in Parliament on April 22 that 430 Africans had already been shot 'while resisting arrest or attempting to escape'. One might have thought that even a Tory Minister would no longer have the effrontery to use that disgraceful euphemism for police killing. Canon Bewes has spoken publicly of what was privately known—that Kikuyu are beaten to death by the police in efforts to get them to inform against their own people. *The Times* admitted

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that allegations of 'ill treatment of Kikuyu suspects in order to get them to talk may be well-founded', and it added that 'in extenuation it should be said that the crimes which (the police) have been called upon to investigate make restraint most difficult to exercise'. But if there be extenuating circumstances for police torture, illegal arrests and mass executions, what about the intolerable, age-long provocation of the Kikuyu people—robbed of their lands, forced to live in squalor and want, insulted because of their race, assaulted when they seek to organise for their rights. Is there no extenuation here? The forgiveness of *The Times* is a one-way affair.

When the Kikuyu organise to fight for their freedom, the cry of 'murder gangs' goes up as it once went up against the people of Ireland. Let the *Irish Times* of April 10, 1953, answer that from its own impressive experience:

> The papers are constantly reporting the killing of Africans while 'resisting arrest', 'failing to halt' or 'attempting to escape'. These are terms which Irish people remember as synonymous with sheer murder by British forces and police of unarmed Irishmen and women. The recurrence of such expressions in reports from Kenya has a sinister ring in Irish ears. Whatever the happenings, it has become evident that the mass of the people are against the present regime. Most of the penalties have been inflicted for 'refusing to give information'. This was also a standard 'crime' in Ireland thirty years ago.

In Kenya the struggle has taken a violent form for clearly definable local reasons. In South Africa it has reached great heights in the united civil disobedience campaign. In the central areas new forms of struggle against Central African Federation are emerging. In the West, in Nigeria, a united fight, supported by the mass of the people, is being waged against the fraudulent and unworkable Constitution. In the North, in the French-occupied territories, every type of mass struggle is taking place in waves of increasing power. In Egypt and the Sudan the nation-wide movement for national liberation is rapidly maturing. Wherever you turn, you find Africa awakening, struggling to her feet, just as Asia has struggled to hers.

Faced with this, what do people in Britain say? The Tory reaction is uncomplicated, founded as it is upon the principles of colonial Government denounced long ago by Lord Erskine

> . . . having no rest in consent and affection, no foundation in similarity of interests, nor support from any one principle that unites men together in society, (it) could only be upheld by alternate strategem and force.

In the Gold Coast, strategem; in Kenya, force; in Central Africa, the two.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Right-wing leaders of the Labour Party when they were in power (and even now that they are in opposition) combined the two methods, using them variously as the situation required. In West Africa, where they were faced with a relatively developed African bourgeoisie on the one hand, and a highly explosive general situation on the other, strategem was the order of the day. But it is not the naming of Kwame Nkumah as 'prime minister' that will dam or divert the sweeping national torrent in the Gold Coast or elsewhere.

After all, the Macpherson Constitution in Nigeria was supposed to head the movement for freedom and democracy into safe channels. But today the Nigeria national movement is reaching new heights, and new political alignments are manifesting themselves in the struggle against that very Constitution. Perhaps the Africans themselves are in a better position than anyone else to judge the benefits of Right-wing Labour rule and the reliability of Right-wing Labour talk. On January 10 of this year, the *West African Pilot* wrote:

> The British Labour Party delegation now in Lagos must have realised that the masses of this country are not giving them even a cold welcome. . . . The Labour Party in Great Britain is a party of the masses, and when some of their representatives come to this country and arouse no mass interest, then it must be logically concluded that something is fundamentally wrong with that mission. In this instance, the thing wrong is Mr. James Griffiths, former Colonial Secretary. . . . It was Mr. Griffiths who refused to do anything to bring to book the shooters of the 21 Enugu miners on November 18, 1949. We assess the attitude of a man to Nigeria when he is in power. . . . But now that Mr. Churchill's party has chased him out of the Colonial Office, Mr. Griffiths wants to pretend to be a champion. We do not require his services now, thank goodness. So he can return to Wales from whence he came.

To which nothing useful can be added, except the essential qualification that Mr. Griffiths is one thing and the rank and file of the Labour Party another.

It is with the rank and file of the movement that we are concerned. And it is time that all of us in the movement realised how urgent and important are the problems set for us by the upsurge in Africa. That upsurge is one of the two or three most important political facts of our time. It is an integral part of the general struggle for emancipation, democracy and peace that the common people everywhere—including Britain—are now engaged upon. It is one of the most important sectors of that struggle. This being so, solidarity with the peoples of Africa ceases to be an act of charity and becomes an act of profound self-interest for the people of Britain. The

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

African peoples are themselves ending for ever the myths of 'backwardness' and the alleged inferiority of the coloured races. They are freeing themselves by their own exertions and—to adapt a useful phrase—helping to free us all by their example. Every blow they strike against colonialism is a blow against capitalist exploitation of every kind; every time they force a high command to shift an airfield, dismantle a base, reject as unreliable a territory once considered safe for military purposes, they are contributing powerfully to the movement against a future war; when they wring concessions from the British Government or a British monopoly, they weaken those forces against which our own Labour Movement is fighting. We owe the people of Africa far more than any solidarity movement here can ever repay.

But solidarity there must be, not only to fulfil the honoured traditions of our movement, but to support our African allies. We must demonstrate by our actions that this is not a racial conflict of Black versus White, but a conflict of the common people—Black and White alike—against oppression, exploitation and war. We have not yet done this. We have scarcely begun to do our duty. We have not begun to understand our own interest. It is high time and more that we did.

FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

AN INTERESTING PREDICTION

It is perfectly possible to imagine a formal recognition of complete independence of India, in which the reality of imperialist exploitation continues unchanged through Indian bourgeois republican forms if financial penetration and dependence on British capital is already complete and remains unbroken. . . .

In the last resort, the difference between independence and Dominion status, if taken formally and in isolation, may be no more than a constitutional figment. It is the reality that matters. *The reality of independence depends upon the breaking of the power of British capital in India.* . . .

In order to make clear the real meaning of independence it is necessary that it must be combined with a more concrete demand, expressing its character, i.e., the direct attack on British imperialist exploitation. The demand for independence needs to be combined with the demand for the repudiation of the foreign debts and expropriation of the foreign concessions and capital holdings in India. Then alone will the demand for independence take on its real and living character.

(From *Notes of the Month*, by R.P.D., June, 1928.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ON THE RAZOR'S EDGE

IVOR MONTAGU

THIS is one of the historic moments when humanity is poised before a choice. The choice is not so dramatic, immediate, razor-like as that between instant peace and instant war. Nevertheless, in our laborious climb we have reached one of those watershed areas, wherefrom the currents flow down, in the main, on one side or the other—a parting of ways.

Let us not doubt mankind's ultimate destination, but the question is whether we approach it through blooming fields and valleys or past rocks and precipices of an uncomfortable, not to say highly dangerous, character.

The crucial historical situation at which we have arrived, perceptible at last to everyone who participated in, or even merely read about the House of Commons Foreign Affairs Debate, is compounded of three strands, each interwoven with and affecting the other. These are: the crisis and bankruptcy of American policy; the growing moral authority of the Soviet Union, People's China, and the colonial and dependent peoples demanding liberation; the growing triumph of the ideas of the forces of peace.

We shall examine these successively.

What is the fundament of the crisis facing Eisenhower, Dulles, the State Department, the Pentagon, McCarthy and Macarran? It is—complete isolation. The New Isolationists have succeeded in so completely antagonising even their hitherto associated forces that, with the exception of Chiang, Rhee and Adenauer, there is nowhere, anywhere, that they can count on for automatic support for their enterprises. Wildly and with frantic effort, the preceding administration of the U.S.A., Truman and Acheson, sought to carry along with them subordinates and satellites in the quest for world dominion. They veiled arrogance and aggression in manoeuvre, cloaked it as 'collective' action, sometimes even remembered to be half-polite. They contrived, for the most part successfully, to avoid having 'to go it alone'.

But the careful contrivances of their diplomacy, already worn thin by reality, have been carelessly torn asunder by the bluster of the new dispensation.

How times have changed can be seen by glancing at the record of the United Nations. A gulf yawns already between the days of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stampede, brutally violating the charter, whereby in June, 1950, the State Department secured its rubber-stamp for MacArthur's *fait accompli* in Korea, and 1953, where Eisenhower and Dulles so little dared even submit the Laos situation to the U.N. that they were reduced to labelling it 'aggression' themselves, like name-calling schoolboys. Their voting-bloc, which has in any case long ceased to represent the majority of the world's population, weakened by the secession of the Arab-Asian cave, now finds even its majority of United Nations votes slipping away, and no longer dependable, on all sorts of issues, from the admission of new members to the ending of the Korean War.

Who wants to support them? Where can they turn? What can they do? Who, besides the criminals guilty of robbery with violence who choose that task rather than punishment when offered the alternative by an English judge, wants to extend the war in the Far East? Not the Yanks—from here, at least, they want to come home. Not the South Americans, who take to the jungle as guerrillas rather than submit to recruitment for Korea. The Asians? So prettily offered the chance of fighting Asians by the U.S. President. The British? The Board of Film Censors would not allow the answer on a sound track.

The Japanese don't want to be armed. Nor do the Germans. The French don't want to be 'integrated'. The only way the Yoshidas, the Pinay-Mayers, the de Gasperis and the Adenauers can retain office is by rigging elections. As Churchill and Attlee have been shrewd enough to demonstrate, no politician in Britain stands a chance who does not show at least verbal insubordination to Washington. Bloc or no bloc, the peoples are sick of the occupation forces, sick of the arms race, sick of the stupid attempt to keep the People's Republic of China out of the comity of nations.

Who, but Franco and von Manstein, does support the call to 'liberate' the People's Democracies? Who, but Malcolm MacDonald and Sir Waldron Smithers, takes seriously the contention that Asian and African reluctance to be downtrodden is proof of bellicosity from Moscow or Peking? Can the Pentagon recover popularity by bombing China, or even roasting human flesh again with some of those fireworks they keep publicising in the Alamos desert? An intensified blockade? Even the U.S. press admits it would be the last straw driving America's hoped-for allies 'into the arms of the Communists'. With less, even, than six months in office and out from behind his screen of non-officialness, Dulles is being

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spoken of as a 'failure', but the fault, dear Dulles, is not in yourself but in the stars to which you have hitched your unrealisable ambitions.

The State Department can bribe Ministers, instal and browbeat Governments, but what is all this worth if the peoples decline to deliver? Like MIGless Clark, the rest of his tribe is learning the painful lesson that, from some people there are some things dollars don't buy.

On what does the growing authority of the U.S.S.R. and the People's Republic of China depend? On the *inevitably* increasing knowledge throughout the rest of the world of the real state of affairs within these countries, of their real policies, bursting through all the dark curtains and shattering the flimsy libels. To save face, the Western press and radio pretends, and speculates about, some 'new turn of policy' in 'the Soviet camp.' To elucidate the invented mystery they 'discover' in April what Malenkov already said first in October, quote from Bulganin what they effectively burked when Stalin said it again and again throughout the years, and even announce in headlines of assumed surprise that Molotov seems to favour a Peace Pact. Let us not grudge them their little subterfuges. What has changed is not Soviet policy, but themselves. And it is a reflection of the change in public opinion, the increased enlightenment respecting American ambition, the increased demand for truth, that what was hidden, now can be so no longer.

Toward this change, the world movement for peace has contributed mightily. The ideas of the world peace movement: negotiation between the Great Powers, cease-fire in Korea, negotiated settlement on Germany, settlement of all issues by peaceful means, leading to abatement of the arms drive, elimination of trade barriers, fair and due respect to the national rights of all—these in less or more degree represent a sentiment that is already overwhelmingly shared by the majority of mankind.

What piddling and dingy parrot cries seem the bans and denigrations launched against the world peace movement as an 'arm of Soviet policy,' 'disobedience to the Labour movement' and the like, in face of the majestic triumph of its principles in the minds of men!

It is the very magnitude of their triumph that contains a danger. A creeping complacency threatens, an easy belief that peace is so nearly won, its coming must be inevitable. *But the movement of mass opinion is not yet translated into a mass movement of action,*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and until it is, the policies of the promoters of wars will not change, only their words.

Eisenhower talks peace, but the conditions he lays down are treated by Dulles as an ultimatum. Harrison talks armistice, but each new time he thumps the table sees more civilian slaughters by U.S. aircraft and British naval guns, more dead soldiers in the trenches of each side. Churchill criticises U.S.A., but reserves his active friendship for Adenauer and Tito, Nazi generals and Japanese princes. Attlee makes a speech that would have sounded 'red' at Sheffield, but he abates not a jot his hostility to mass activity for peace. These gentlemen's common conception of 'democracy'—as with Baldwin and the peace-ballot, Chamberlain and the rape of the Spanish republic—is to lay low and pay lip service to the desires and demands of the peoples, meanwhile preparing, or at least facilitating, the *fait accompli*. They seek to weather the peace storm, while uninterruptedly continuing their preparation for war.

Let no one underestimate the danger. Peace half-won is not won at all. From Formosa to Bonn, the world contains an infinity of provocation possibilities for MacArthurs and MacCarthys. The Adenauers and germ generals whom Eisenhower sees fit to place at the supreme U.S. tiller are precisely those who have clamoured for all-out shooting licenses. The very fact that Churchill, Attlee, the Pope, Nehru, the French Chamber Foreign Affairs Committee, countless trade union meetings, newspapers and letter-writers to newspapers in all lands now parallel the Congress of Peoples for Peace and the 650 millions who signed the Peace Pact Appeal in calling for negotiation, only augments the crazy desperation of the China Lobby and Pentagon Brass. The nearness of the triumph of peace itself entails increase of peril of precipitation of war. The Dulles who is touring the Middle East and South Asia is the same Dulles who toured the 38th Parallel exactly three years ago.

The guarantee of security lies in the fact that the peoples are not the same, their eyes are more open. But it is not enough to see and know. Knowledge must become action. The peace movement is not a political movement, it does not seek to change social systems or subvert governments. It imposes but one policy—peace. It is not a sixth world power, arguing with the other five what shall be their solutions, their concessions, or the limit of their concessions. It prescribes no precise form of negotiation, in U.N. or out, by five or by four, by three or by two. It has only one argument and one prescription—negotiate! It asks no Conservative or Christian, no

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour stalwart or Communist, no citizen or subject of any nation on earth, to forswear loyalty or party—it insists only that the issues can and must be negotiated, must not be attempted to be settled by force. The World Council of Peace is meeting this month in Budapest. For this campaign it has the right to call for support by all, and all have the duty to give support, after whatever fashion seems right to them. Let none imitate the Pharisee who passed up that duty by passing by. This is an hour of decision. All around present events cry out their message that the will of the people *can* prevail. Forget the differences of the past, the disagreements that do not matter, let all share now in this one task.

DOES PEACE MEAN SLUMP?

JOHN EATON

'PEACE? Peace means slump'—this is the last argument of the war-mongers, the stock-exchange gamblers, the speculators on war profits. This is the argument shouted aloud in the U.S.A.* and echoed here publicly in the *Manchester Guardian*. But it is not a new argument. It was put forward in 1951 and 1952 and was answered eight months ago by Malenkov in his speech to the 19th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

> The bellicose circles in the U.S.A. and Britain are constantly reiterating that the armaments race alone can keep the industries in capitalist countries running. Actually, however, there is another prospect, the prospect of developing and expanding commercial relations between all countries irrespective of the difference in social systems. This can keep the industries in the industrially developed countries running for many years to come, can ensure the sale of products of which one country has an abundance to other countries, can help to raise the economies of the underdeveloped countries, and thereby bring about lasting economic co-operation. (5.10.1952).

Malenkov's words deserve to be carefully noted as does much else in his speech, which has not commanded the attention in the British

---

* Within hours after the Soviet Union made its latest gesture about Korea, whispers were running up and down Wall Street about a 'Malenkov depression'. Within a few days, stocks had lost billions in paper values on the open rumour that a truce only in Korea would be enough to send us into a recession.

And real peace? On all sides I've heard the talk and surely you have too. . . . 'Real peace would knock the props from under us. . . . America would plunge into a slump so severe that our system would be in mortal danger. . . . That's Malenkov's new game, that's what he's hoping for, that's why he's making the gestures. . . . We can't afford to have peace. . . .'

The fear of depression in our nation is almost as deep—if not as deep—as the fear of global war itself. And by some horrible alchemy, 'peace' and 'depression' seem to have been merged.

(Sylvia Porter, *Boston Herald*, April 23, 1953).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labour movement that it warrants. Malenkov was speaking for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union means what it says. 'Our Party', said Malenkov, 'does not throw words to the winds'.

Most serious account needs therefore to be taken of Malenkov's offer to 'the more sober-minded and progressive politicians in the European and other capitalist countries, those who . . . are beginning to come out against war'. To such people Malenkov promised, 'If they take this new path, European and other countries will meet with the complete understanding on the part of all the peace-loving countries'. And these remarks were greeted with loud and prolonged applause from the Congress. There need, therefore, be no doubts whatsoever that if Britain takes the path of peace she will be met with the fullest co-operation in the economic field as well as in the diplomatic from the Soviet Union, China and the other People's Democracies.

A prospect of great and rapid improvement in Britain's economic situation will open up once the burden of an overwhelming arms expenditure, the crippling restrictions on East-West trade and the persistent interference of the American administration have been removed and cease to block the development of Britain's economy in a direction favourable to the interests of the British people. But such developments will not come of themselves. They will require positive action by the British Government and will only come as a result of the people fighting for the policies that are required. Moreover, these new policies will meet with the bitterest opposition—often in new and disguised forms—from the monopolies and their political representatives favouring the war policies.

The 'peace-means-slump' talk is already doing duty for the warmongers and spreading anxiety about the economic consequences of peace. Our poverty today, the instability of our markets today, the distortion in the structure of our economy today, all of these things have been aggravated by militarisation and an ending of the arms programme would tremendously ease our economic position. We need to rid ourselves completely of the illusion that war means work and economic prosperity.

The intensified militarisation of the British and American economies began in 1950. Its first impact was, naturally, to raise industrial production. But already by 1952 the level of total production was ceasing to rise and even beginning to fall, despite the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

People's Republic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fact that military expenditure was expanding. Here are the production indices for Britain and America taking 1950=100:

	1950	1951	1952
United States ...	100	110	109.5
United Kingdom ...	100	103	100

It is already evident that military expenditure is beginning to drag back Britain's economic development. It is making our economy increasingly lop-sided. Consumption goods industries have contracted because the masses of the people lack the means to buy. Taxes are heavier because of the war programme. War expenditure inflates prices. People have money only for necessities and spend an increasing share of what they get on food. The index of textile production for 1952 showed a fall of one-fifth on 1950. China and earthenware was down by one per cent. Paper and printing down by one-tenth. Similar situations are developing in other capitalist countries and export markets are shrinking. Balance of payments crises are faced in country after country and imports, particularly of goods for consumption, are restricted. In a number of countries there is growing financial instability.

In Britain the bulk of the war orders fall on a limited sector of the engineering industry (between a quarter and a third only of the whole engineering industry), and conflict with the most easily saleable exports. Over the period from 1950 metal goods taken by the arms programme have increased as follows (in £ millions at 1951 factory prices):

1950	1951	1952
185	275	410

Metal goods used for home investment and going for exports are now beginning to decline. Here are the corresponding figures:

	1950	1951	1952
Investment ...	965	985	940
Exports ...	1,000	1,050	1,010

Personal consumption has declined throughout this period. Here are the official figures (at 1948 market prices):

	1950	1951	1952
Total	8,688	8,675	8,581
of which:			
Food	2,400	2,399	2,389
Household goods	649	612	562
Clothing ...	945	857	832

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We see here evidence of the tendencies about which Malenkov speaks in the following terms:

> The militarisation of the national economy does not remove, but, on the contrary, widens the gap between production potentialties and the declining effective demand of the population, which the ruling upper circles in the capitalist countries are reducing to the extreme minimum. This causes progressive contraction of the capitalist market. Thus, the expansion of war production inevitably leads to the maturing of a new profound economic crisis. . . .
>
> The armaments drive in which the rulers of Britain, France, Italy, Western Germany, Belgium, Norway and other capitalist countries are now engaged in obedience to the dictates of the American monopolies is wrecking the economy of these countries and driving them to disaster.

Continued militarisation of Britain's economy can only accelerate the deterioration in our economic position. Peace and the shedding of the military burden gives us hope, despite the disastrous legacy of past policies that we inevitably inherit.

Propaganda often finds its way in by the back door and the 'war-means-work' argument is sometimes used, turned inside out, by people whose intention it is to attack imperialism. They argue something like this: 'once the imperialists are forced to stop their arms expenditure, the props will be removed, there will be nothing to stop the onset of a slump of gigantic proportions, capitalism will stand exposed, the victory of socialism will be assured.' How this line of talk plays into the imperialist's hands and how much it forgets about the realities! The arms expenditure is not propping up capitalism; it itself *accentuates* the contradictions. Already the expanding arms orders have turned from a stimulus to a brake on the expansion of production generally. Already economic conditions are worsening for the masses of the people not only in the economically backward countries but also in the industrially advanced countries of Europe. Moreover the whole line of argument implies passivity in the face of an inevitable march of events, whereas the exposure of capitalism and the victory of socialism comes only from activity in struggle by the workers and their allies amongst the broad masses of the people against the conditions that the imperialists seek to impose upon them.

In this situation the positive economic policies of peace have to be clearly understood and untiringly fought for by the supporters of peace. Every socialist will understand that within the framework of capitalism the economic programme of the peace movement will suffer from limitations and shortcomings that will only be removed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with the removal of capitalism from its commanding position. Every socialist will know that as long as imperialism exists the instigators of war will be at work. But it would be a poor state of affairs if ability to look forward to the future became an excuse for destroying confidence in the present; and for the present it is the job of socialists to give the peace movement confidence in what it can achieve in the stage of events in which we now find ourselves. If we look at the facts we shall see that the achievements of the peace movement's aims in the diplomatic field can go hand in hand with a great improvement in the economic situation provided the movement has its own economic programme to set against the imperialists and is prepared to fight for it with might and main. The economic issues requiring consideration fall mainly into three groups. First, how are living standards to be raised and the stagnation in the consumer goods industries to be ended? Secondly, how is the cutting of state expenditure on arms to be compensated? Thirdly, how is the problem of shrinking export markets to be met?

A cut in the arms programmes will leave more raw materials (and particularly imported raw materials) for the consumer goods industries; make it possible to supply more and better plant and equipment to these industries; make capacity available for the re-equipment of British industry generally and also enable us to supply more plant and machinery for export. However, the stimulus to expanding production of consumer goods and improved industrial equipment can only come from all-round and substantial increases in wage-levels. These, of course, will be hotly resisted by the monopoly capitalists whose first thoughts will always be for increased exploitation and maximum profits. The first plank in a programme of economic development is therefore, to support, on the widest possible scale, the workers' demands for increased wages. This will at the same time greatly help professional people and other sections of the middle-classes to get improved conditions for themselves. It is also important that taxes limiting consumption should be removed.

A cut in state expenditure on arms makes it immediately possible to restore the cuts made in social services. Liberal expenditure on hospitals and health centres and their equipment, on schools and other educational services, on housing, on town planning, on agriculture, on water ways and flood control and on many other public services, including the improvement of technical standards in industry, will increase people's enjoyment of life and give them

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

confidence in the possibilities of economic progress. It is for just such reasons that the imperialists who are prepared to countenance the wildest extravagances in arms expenditure will oppose socially progressive public expenditure tooth and nail. Arms expenditure not only means vast profits for the monopoly capitalists, it also enables them to strengthen their position of economic and political domination. Expenditure on social advancement, on the other hand, builds up the confidence of the masses of the people and in so far as it comes as the fruit of political struggle, whets their appetites for progressive politics.

It is in the field of foreign trade that the fruits of peace are greatest and most beneficial to the economy of Britain. Some idea of the possibilities can be gathered from the experiences of the countries that have been more ready than Britain has been to trade with Eastern Europe. Finland, for example, whose industrial potential is about one-fortieth of that of Britain had in October, 1952, trade agreements in force with the U.S.S.R. and the other democracies of Eastern Europe providing for trade to an approximate total of £60 million in each direction. At this time the only agreements that Britain had were for the importation of 150,000 tons of maize and 50,000 tons of oats from the Soviet Union and with Czechoslovakia for exports of approximately £1½ million and imports of £6 million (the balance being taken for indemnity for British property nationalised by Czechoslovakia). Finland has in recent years very considerably expanded her volume of exports of which exports to Eastern Europe accounted for 18 per cent. in the first half of 1952 as against 1.7 per cent. to the same countries in 1938. Sweden has also, though to a lesser degree, already benefitted from trade with Eastern Europe. Her volume of exports to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe has increased and as a percentage of all Sweden's trade these exports are rather more than they were pre-war (6.6 per cent. in first half of 1952 as against 6.3 per cent. in 1938). In October, 1952, Sweden had trade agreements in force with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe providing for exports of approximately £45 million and for a slightly higher total of imports. Ceylon has entered into a most favourable trade agreement with China which provides her with a market for the greater part of her output of rubber at prices above those ruling on the world market and secures her supplies of rice at prices below the world market prices. In addition the agreement provides for trade in a number of other commodities.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meanwhile Britain's exports to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe account (in 1951 and the first half of 1952) for only 0.6 per cent. of her exports as against 4.5 per cent. in 1938. Britain's trade with China is a mere fraction of what it might be. If this trade were merely to return proportionately to the same position as it occupied before the war, we would get an increase of some £30 million to £40 million. But with the removal of the American restrictions it could quickly mount far beyond those levels. If Britain were free to export machine tools, generating plant and numerous other kinds of plant and equipment, she would have in China a long-lasting and expanding market. Is it not obvious that when a country with a population of 500,000,000 sets out on the path of industrialisation, its demand for the goods that the British engineering industry can produce will be immense? Moreover, if long-term trade arrangements are entered into, there is a good possibility of China being able to pay for the goods she receives with supplies which we have hitherto been buying at the cost of adding to our menacing 'dollar gap'. Wheat, cotton and tobacco, the goods on which our dollar expenditure is heaviest, are all produced in vast quantities in China. In addition China is a large exporter of groundnuts, soya beans and other oil seeds, tung oil, bristles, frozen and dried eggs, silk and many other valuable commodities. Liberation of the peasantry from the shackles of feudalism is leading to rapid expansion in the output of all these products. There are therefore excellent possibilities of complementary developments of trade between Britain and China. In addition, there is great scope for East-West trade with British empire countries which in turn would help to stimulate trade within the empire.

Peace in itself is worth fighting for; but it also provides the answer and the only answer to the profound economic problems with which Britain is faced. It is time now to press with the utmost determination for a change in the orientation of our trading policy. Friendly trading relations with the markets of the socialist world will enable Britain to become economically independent of America, provide stable markets at a time of growing instability and uncertainty in the export markets of the capitalist world, strengthen the bonds of friendship and understanding between the peoples of the world. Peaceful trade, rising standards of living for the people and improved social services, these are the bases of the programme with which to combat the economic devastation into which the policies of imperialism are plunging Britain and the British Empire.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN OLD SUPERSTITION— A NEW DISGRACE

WILLIAM MORRIS

(We reprint for its topical interest the article written by William Morris on the occasion of Queen Victoria's Jubilee, in "The Commonweal" of Saturday, June 25, 1887.—Ed., L.M.)

AS was said last week, the contempt with which all Socialists must necessarily look on the idiotic court ceremony of the week has prevented anything more than a mere hint being given in the *Commonweal* about the Jubilee. And besides this, Socialists feel of course that the mere abolition of the monarchy would help them little if it only gave place to a middle-class republic; such an one, for example, as that which butchered so many thousands of citizens at Paris in 1871 and now in 1887 grown respectable and liberal, still blocks the way to all progress in France, and holds out a hand to the corruption of society there. Nevertheless, now the monstrous stupidity is on us (for I am necessarily writing before the event), one's indignation swells pretty much to the bursting-point, and I really must take advantage of my position to relieve my feelings, even at the expense of being considered somewhat old-fashioned. And we must not after all forget what the hideous, revolting, and vulgar tomfoolery in question really means nowadays, or how truly its hideousness and vulgarity of upholstery symbolises the innate spirit which has forced the skinny twaddle on a nation that is in the habit of boasting (how vainly!) of its practicality. Such a ceremony would once have meant something very different to what it does now. Time was when the central figure in the procession from palace to Abbey would have been a man or woman whose personality would have been felt, though acting according to the ethics and maxims of feudality. The central figure in the procession would at the worst have been also in the centre of the feudal warriors gathered for the battle, and not seldom in the centre of the enemy's host. The administration of affairs, the balancing of the various claims of the groups of the feudal hierarchy, the assertion of the due rights of the great manor (scarcely yet a country)—all these would have been the duties of the central figure of a great royal procession; and no monarch of England, not even the worst of the Angevines or the most faineant of the Plantagenets could altogether neglect such duties; they had to do the deeds of men and women, however

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

faulty or perverse, and not the deeds of a gilt gibbie-stick; they were each of them a part of the public, and an active part too.

All that is as dead as King Harold now. The nucleus of that grievous mass of flunkeyism which has been a disgrace even to disgraceful London (although the coolness with which her duties are neglected is from time to time noticed by the public and the press) is on the whole considered as a satisfactory representative of what she does represent; so satisfactory that we are called upon to take part in a set of antics in her honour compared with which a corobbery of Australian black-fellows is a decent and dignified performance.

What is it then that this central figure does represent? Not the feudal hierarchy, dead centuries ago; not the queer, pedantic divine-right-of-kings, whose struggle with the bourgeois divine-right of parliamentary majority played such an important part in developing the supremacy of that bourgeoisie. No, it does not represent these extinct superstitions, but, superstition as it is itself, it represents commercial realities, rather to wit, jobbery official and commercial, and its foundation the Privilege of Capital, set on a background of the due performance of the conventional domestic duties; in short, the representation of the anti-social spirit in its fulness is what is required of it.

That is the reason why the career of the present representative is, in spite of those few grumblings aforesaid, so eminently satisfactory. It has been the life of a respectable official who has always been careful to give the minimum of work for the maximum of pay, to keep the public well at arm's length, and to abstain from any fantastic act of generosity, which might have been taken as a precedent in the future. All this has been expected of it and it has performed it in a way which has duly earned the shouts of the holiday-makers, the upholsterers, firework makers, gasfitters and others who may gain some temporary advantage from the Royal (but shabby) Jubilee Circus, as well as the deeper-seated applause of those whose be-all and end-all is the continuance of respectable robbery. For us Revolutionists it is clear that the gibbie-stick line of conduct is better than one with some show of human interest in it would have been; so that we have nothing to complain of. The more reaction is stripped of sentiment the better for us.

One word before this loathsome subject of the Jubilee is consigned to its due dust-heap. Fifty years ago the country was yet in the throes of that unorganised but formidable insurrection which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

followed on the industrial revolution, and the reckless greed of those benefitted by it—the capitalists, to wit. That insurrection was damped down by the commercial successes which so much increased the numbers and power of the definitely middle classes, so that twenty-five years ago a survivor of the discontent of 1837 might well have thought that all was over. But unbridled competition has forced the pace more than any one could have guessed it would; fifty years is gone, and once more we have 'discontent' amongst us, if not wider spread than before, yet at least deeper seated, and with no apparent staving-off remedy before it except Mr. Chamberlain's feeble attempts at peasant-proprietorship. And even this vulgar Royal Upholstery procession, trumpery as it is, may deepen the discontent a little, when the newspapers are once more empty of it, and when people wake up, as on the morrow of a disgraceful orgie, to find dull trade all the duller for it, and have to face according to their position the wearisome struggle for riches, for place, for respectability, for decent livelihood, for bare subsistence, in the teeth of growing competition in a society now at last showing its rottenness openly.

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL: *To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy 4s. 6d.; a year's subscription 54s.*

To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy 5s.; a year's subscription 60s. To Aden, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq and Syria, post free, 4s. per copy; a year's subscription 48s.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CHURCHES IN EASTERN EUROPE

REV. STANLEY EVANS

ADDRESSING the Convocation of York on May 7th, the Archbishop, Dr. Garbett, suggested a United Nations investigation of the facts about 'religious persecution' in order that they might be published to the world. 'Religious persecution', he said, 'is so detestable that while it continues it must be a fatal obstacle to a good understanding between the democracies and the persecuting States'.

The theme is a well-worn one, but put forward as authoritatively as this at a time when the Prime Minister chooses to make a speech which asks for East-West discussions the threat that there is here 'a fatal obstacle to understanding' obviously calls for some discussion, and particularly so when it is backed by a pamphlet coming from the National Peace Council which will be referred to later in this article.

It seems that there are those who will never learn from experience. We have, of course, had all this before and we ought by now to have some idea as to how much weight to attach to it. For years leading ecclesiastics and conservatives vied with each other to pump into the populace the idea of a deadly persecution of religion in the U.S.S.R. 'Almost all the visible signs of religion have disappeared by now and the last churches are demolished' wrote a supposed expert in a supposedly authoritative church journal (*Sobernost*) in June, 1939. Precisely two years later the B.B.C. was announcing to an astonished Britain that thousands of people who had failed to get inside the cathedral, stood in a Moscow Square while prayers were offered for the country on June 22, 1941, and at a later date the Archbishop of York himself went to Moscow and came back to report on the flourishing condition of the Orthodox Church.

The Leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church have stated over and over again that they are not, and have not been, persecuted. The late Patriarch, Sergius, heralded after his death by Archbishop Temple as a great and wise church leader, put it like this answering foreign correspondents in 1942:

> No one in Russia has ever hindered us from serving our Lord Jesus Christ. There has never yet been a case in the Soviet Union when any one suffered for his Orthodox faith, for preaching the teachings of Christ.
>
> There were, of course, enemies of the Soviet order among leaders of the Russian Orthodox Church who infringed the holy law. Naturally Russia could not tolerate such a state of affairs.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Priests in our country have the right to vote. They pay taxes like other citizens. We appoint priests and bishops to the various parishes and dioceses without any hindrance whatsoever. Our Church suffers from no insufficiency of material equipment for religious services. The holy word resounds freely in our churches.

Behind this, of course, there is a story. And it is a very important story. Before the Russian Revolution not only were all churches other than the Orthodox oppressed by the State, but Orthodoxy was tolerated only as an instrument of the State. Its job was to preach submission to the 'Big Father' (God) and the 'Little Father' (the Tsar) and to make quite sure that it did this it was presided over by a lay official responsible directly to the Tsar. It was deeply corrupt and it was overwhelmingly anti-Semitic. Good, honest elements of course there were, but it was not they but the nominees of Rasputin who became Bishops. All this was a commonplace in all books on Russia published in this country before 1917.

The Revolution, therefore, brought a great challenge to the Church. Some of its leaders replied by going into exile; some by fighting with the White armies; others after a considerable internal struggle, by taking the side of the people. If the supporters of the White armies suffered punishment they were, of course, victims of 'religious persecution'. On the other hand those who sided with the people, or who gradually ceased to struggle against the people found themselves, no longer being a church based on privilege, turning back to their own Gospel. It is the result of this that we see before us today.

This result is that genuinely based on their own teaching the Soviet Churches play a leading part in the world peace movement and have arrived at the position, their own old dust having cleared away, that they cannot envisage a Christian doing anything else unless he is playing some kind of politics that have nothing in common with Christianity. As to their own government their attitude was put by the Archbishop Luke of Simferopol in the *Journal of the Moscow Patriarchate* in 1947:

What is our real attitude towards our government, towards our new State structure?

. . .We have no causes whatsoever for enmity to our government, for it has given complete freedom to the Church and does not interfere in its internal affairs. We, of course, utterly deny materialism, the ideological basis of communism. But that does not prevent us seeing all the good: all the great social truths which our new State structure has given us. And so we welcome it with pure hearts, with the joy which inspires all friends of progress. We welcome the universal political equality which has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been given to the many millions of non-Russians in the U.S.S.R. who previously bore the degrading title of 'other nationalities', and their great cultural successes. We welcome the full emancipation of women, the tremendous successes of science, the universal free education and the great care the government takes for the health of the people.

This, surely, is a position which anybody should be able to understand.

Now it is this story which has been partly, but only partly, repeated in the New Democracies of Eastern Europe since the Second World War. It is not just the same because not all the churches concerned were so deeply corrupted as was the Russian Orthodox Church in 1917; because some of them had shared the historic struggles of their peoples as the Bulgarian Orthodox Church in the struggle against the Turks; because some had shared the struggle of their people against Nazism; because some, on the other hand, were so deeply tainted with collaboration that it was utterly out of the question for them to remain in the church leadership after the war and so a new start could be made.

The position has therefore been, with the very different backgrounds of the different churches of different countries that in the frame of laws moulded by the past of their own country, they have not only been allowed to develop freely but have developed freely with only one road barred to them and that barred firmly by law—the road of treason, of collaboration with the enemies of their people at home or abroad. This again was put quite clearly by the Minister of Cults in Rumania in a speech he made when a new Patriarch was being elected in 1948:

The Government and the people are one. The Government belongs to the people and asks nothing for itself or for a minority. But it does ask for something—because the people ask it, because the believers ask it, because even the teaching of the Church asks it—to be united with the legitimate aspirations of the people who have come into their own after centuries of suffering. They have taken their fate into their own hands and our country is now a peoples' republic—a good home for both the town workers and the country workers. . . .

When we say that the people are satisfied today from the religious point of view, we do not ignore the fact that there are currents of thought opposed to the spirit of brotherhood and co-operation, but it must be clear to all that their unfriendly agitation is a poisonous plant which does not spring from our national soil. It is a plant sown in ill-will by the enemies of our people outside the country. They propose to gain from those who, in a period of world change, have no better occupation than creating reactionary blocs to plan foreign aid from our disrupters, to agitate for active disruption and to weave sophistries to close the mind not only of other people but also of themselves. They are led by people from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Western and Trans-oceanic States and they regard the church as their tool and their hope. International reaction proposed to use religious institutions. It chooses the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand and the so-called Ecumenical Movement on the other.

Two extreme examples of different paths will illustrate what the Minister was saying. The first is that of the Rumanian Orthodox Church which, when all large landed estates were nationalised in 1948 save those of the church, of its own freewill handed over its title-deeds, stating that it did not so wish to be separated from the people. When this happened all those who then and now talk of religious persecution were silent. Not one church newspaper told the church people of this country that so momentous and historical an event as a church taking the gospel sufficiently seriously as to give up its riches had taken place. The second and opposite example is that of the Cardinal, anti-Semitic, Mindszenty, proved to the hilt by documentary evidence to be plotting to restore a corrupt and out-dated régime and so betraying his country, his people—and the future of his church.

Now all this again must be quite clear to any thoughtful person and certainly to any who will even begin to study the evidence. It is, therefore, deeply to be regretted that the National Peace Council has chosen this moment to produce a booklet (*Christians and Communists*: A Study of relations between Church and State in Eastern Europe, 2s.) which evades this quite simple and straightforward story and propounds the fantastic conclusion 'that it is Communist policy to try to prevent Christian people from fulfilling their true function in society, from acting according to their conscience, and from making spiritual insight the supreme guide to conduct. The more vigorously the Church is fulfilling its prophetic mission, the greater the attempt to reduce it to a position of impotence. If the present trend of action in many States continues, the question may well become one of the actual survival of the Churches, rather than of their adequate functioning.'

Now it is true that this startling conclusion, which appears precisely as we have quoted it, is heaped about by many fair words, the need of understanding, 'the dangers inherent in the careless use of words', the need for peace, even for East-West Church conversations, but nothing can obscure the fact that distortion as grave as this will not encourage the Eastern Churches to talk to the Western Churches and will help only those who are out to sunder the peoples in preparation for war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This conclusion is reached only after a treatment of evidence which cannot be described as serious. A few examples will demonstrate this. On page 6 the reader is told 'Bulgarian Churches may not maintain connections with foreign churches or organisations without the permission of the Foreign Ministry'. He is not told (a) that this law exists to prevent the Roman Catholic Church in Bulgaria being driven by the Vatican into an impossible position and (b) that the Foreign Minister is responsible because historically in Bulgaria the Foreign Office has always been also (quaintly enough) the Ministry for Religious Affairs and that this position has not yet been changed.

On page 6 he is told (of Bulgaria) 'Church officials may be suspended or dismissed at the discretion of the Ministry' (Art. 12). He is not told that the article of the law referred to actually says: 'Ministers, as well as all other officials of the churches, who break the law, offend against public order or public morality, or who work against the democratic institutions of the State, may . . . be temporarily suspended from office or dismissed'.

On page 22 he is told that in Czechoslovakia Archbishop Beran was put under 'house arrest' (which he never was) and later banished from his diocese (which he was) 'for lack of co-operation with the State'. He is not told that this followed from Beran's refusal to take an oath of loyalty of the kind which every cleric of the Church of England takes not only when he is ordained but every time he takes a new job. On page 23 he is told of 'the seizure in January, 1950, of Caritas' (the welfare organisation of the Roman Catholic Church in Poland). The truth is that Caritas was not seized and continues to this day.

So we could go on for page after page citing one direct misstatement after another. It is a profound pity—and it is also both comic and tragic coming from a country whose figures of church attendance have declined throughout this century in a way that would really alarm the church leaders of the countries we are discussing! The leaders of the churches in Eastern Europe, far from having to bewail a drop in church attendance, are concentrating on lofty issues; and the stand they are taking for peace and social justice forms a challenge which the Western churches cannot indefinitely ignore.

ARTISTS FOR PEACE

Readers may be interested to know that at the Royal Hotel, Woburn Place, W.C.1, Artists for Peace are holding their 1953 Exhibition, from June 9 for two weeks.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE OLD BLUNDERER

R. PALME DUTT

IT is a little late in the day to review the concluding volume of *The Times* candid autobiography, which was published last year.* However, the publishers were themselves late in sending a copy to the *Labour Monthly* for review.

This concluding volume, which carries the story effectively to 1939 (not in reality to 1948, as the title implies), maintains the general high standard of preceding volumes in the care of its compilation, the scholarship and liveliness of its writing, and the not inconsiderable degree of candour and even some self-criticism. It throws valuable light, including new information and significant extracts from private letters, on many of the episodes and controversies of this crucial period; notably, the cross-currents of British foreign policy preceding 1914; the extent of the peace by negotiations moves in high circles during the first world war; the Lloyd George coup of 1916; imperial policy, especially in relation to India and Ireland; relations with the United States; the Munich policy and the Abdication.

This is not to say that the famous Olympian blind eye, which receives considerable exposure in these volumes, does not continue to operate also in this record. The General Strike is invisible, as also the suspension of the capitalist press and its replacement by Churchill's *British Gazette*. Munichite 'Appeasement' of Nazism is lamely defended as a reflection of the 'pacifism' of British popular opinion:

> The paper followed the people. It was a lead given by an electorate influenced by Liberal and Pacifist idealism (p. 895).
>
> Printing House Square, like the Government, was helpless in the face of an apparently isolationist Commonwealth and a pacifist Britain (p. 1009).

A curious Trotskyist footnote on p. 262 suggests that the absence of mention of Stalin prior to 1921 might be due to the fact that it is 'possible that Stalin's part in the October revolution has been exaggerated by the epigones'. When history compels a reference to the *Workers' Weekly*, the pair-of-tongs method is applied to veil the indecent name by reference to 'a Leninist weekly'. An elaborate tabulated seven-page appendix, 'The Metropolitan Press: 1884-

* *History of The Times Vol. IV*, 1912-1948. (2 Parts, 1,182 pp. Times Publishing Company. £2 10s.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1947', professes to list every daily newspaper published in London between 1884 and 1947, the date of foundation of each, proprietors, successive editors and policy. Even transient and forgotten ephemera are zealously included, such as the *Daily Courier,* published for 98 issues in 1896, the *Daily Paper,* published for 32 issues in 1904, or *Majority,* published 'for a few issues' in 1906. The *Daily Worker,* published continuously now for close on quarter of a century, and during eighteen years of the period covered, does not exist in this list. The majestic *Times* has not yet heard of it. The last daily newspaper to be founded in London, according to the omniscient *Times,* was the *Daily Herald* in 1912. 'First with the news'.

General press notices which have already appeared have mainly concentrated on the treatment of the Abdication and of the Munich policy. But there is much else.

Here is the fullest story of the Northcliffe Saga—the British counterpart of the Forrestal Story. From his acquisition of *The Times* in 1908 to his death in 1922, Northcliffe was credited with demonic powers in British politics—far exceeding a McCarthy or a Hearst. The Liberal journalist, A. G. Gardiner, described him as 'the poisoner of the streams of human intercourse, the fomenter of war, the preacher of hate, the unscrupulous enemy of human society'. At the *Daily Mail* Anniversary Banquet at Olympia in 1921 the officiating clergyman besought the Almighty to continue to bless 'thy servant Alfred' and enable him to go on 'guiding aright the destinies of this great Empire'. It is now revealed that the madness which overcame him began since 1910 (p. 703). But nobody found it necessary to do anything about it until in 1922 he began pointing a loaded revolver at his own dressing gown as a supposed threatening assassin, and he had to be secluded. An unconfined maniac had terrorised British politics.

Still, Northcliffe had elements of coarse honesty in the midst of the hypocrisy of British upper class politics, as well as undoubted journalistic genius. He said: 'When I want a peerage I will buy it like an honest man'. A dry footnote adds: 'In fact he did pay for his peerage'.

The value of this record of *The Times* as the leader of the British capitalist press is the merciless exposure of its consistent blindness on every great issue of the epoch.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Socialism? 'Socialism . . . was accorded little space in *The Times* before 1906' (p. 35). And even by 1906 'Socialism has little chance in this country, if the Labour movement be taken in the right way' (January 30, 1906)—a not incorrect reflection of the ruling class attitude to this day. The war of 1914, it was complacently expected, 'would finally discredit the Labour Party' and 'would discredit Socialism'. (p. 72).

The Russian Revolution?

> The social aspects of the second revolution do not seem to have been understood in the office at first. The subject was not one which interested Dawson . . . Steed . . . was uninterested in Russian politics. (p. 242).

On November 8, 1917, sixteen lines referred to some movements of 'naval troops under Maximalist orders', but 'street traffic and the general life of the city remain normal'. By November 12 the main news head announced: 'Lenin Losing Control'. The long record of bloomers, repeated predictions of impending Bolshevik collapse, and the notorious antics of *The Times* Riga correspondent followed. A copious and valuable appendix shows that all the rest of the capitalist press was no less hopelessly wrong on the Russian Revolution.

The general crisis of capitalism?

> There is no sign in the office between 1923 and 1933 of a sense that the world of 1914 had gone for ever. (p. 1000).
>
> It was then believed (in 1931) almost universally (*sic*) that the war to end war would have no sequel. (Introduction p. vi).

The future of British rule in India?

> We shall stay in India. . . . Indians will enjoy a great and increasing share in the tasks of administration, but British rule will continue. (February 15, 1922).

Nazism on the eve of Hitler's advent to power?

> On the whole, there seems little reason to expect any immediate change in the outward semblance of German political life. President Hindenburg does not favour quick changes. (Editorial, November 8, 1932).

Nazism after over a year of Hitler Terror?

> There will be plenty of British sympathy with Hitler if he manifestly sticks to the line of helping a genuine renascence of the youth of Germany (letter of the Editor, Dawson, to the Berlin correspondent, March 1, 1934).

There follows the sordid record of Munichism under an Editor who 'had no foreign languages, no knowledge of economics' (p. 794) and 'knew none of the leading personalities, had never read recent European political history' (p. 817).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the very last, up to the eve of the second world war, in the relative assessment of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union:

> It was suspected that Russia might be the theatre of some new political upheaval. The stable country in Europe was Germany, it was thought (p. 912).

Had the record been continued to the second world war, and to the critical eight years since the second world war, the list could be indefinitely extended.

All journals can make mistakes. There is no infallibility or omniscience among any of us, however much the pompous editorial tone of *The Times* might suggest a desire to create such an impression. But to achieve such an unerring consistency of demonstrable blunders on every major social, economic and political issue of the age requires a special genius appropriate to the supreme organ of an ancient ruling class in decline, as it looks out with jaundiced eyes upon a changing world whose transformations it can no longer either understand or control.

So the Old Blunderer (for no one could call the present organ of mincing well-bred propriety a Thunderer) goes blundering along—self-satisfied, blind, blinkered, ignorant and majestically wrong on every major question it tries to handle.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Reviews

THE DEAN ON CHINA

China's New Creative Age, by Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury. (200 pp. Lawrence & Wishart. *6s.*).

LAST September in a P.O.W. camp in North Korea Lieutenant John Quinn of the United States Air Force told me that the main influence in his decision to confess to the use of bacteriological warfare was his reading of *The Socialist Sixth of the World*. 'You know', he explained to me, 'that I'm a Catholic, and the very idea of the Red Dean was like a red rag to a bull as far as I was concerned. But when I'd once picked that book up I couldn't put it down, and after I'd finished it I didn't just feel that I'd learned a lot that I never knew before. . . . It was more than that. I felt that I really knew where I stood about things'.

Now the Dean has done it again. *China's New Creative Age* is a book both for those who already know where they stand and for those who are still trying to find out. It is essentially a factual book—and a book giving the essential facts about social and economic developments in China since its liberation has been overdue for some time. Starting with the history of land reform the Dean shows, illustrating the main course of events with a series of vivid individual stories, both the way in which the land has been divided among the peasants and the way, too, in which a new life has developed out of the changes that have taken place in social organisation and in the outlook of the people. Then, by a skilful transition, his account of the new status of women leads him on to a field particularly his own: the great civil engineering project which was started in the Huai River basin in 1949 and which has already, though the work is still not yet complete, removed the flood menace from an area as large as France and Germany put together. It is a fantastic story, a story of a great battle against natural forces which has been won by the combined efforts of more than two million people working, often with the most primitive equipment, to safeguard the future of a land which has become, in every sense, their own.

Both here and in his account of the development of health and educational services and in his description of recent progress in industry and agriculture, the Dean writes with a fervour that illuminates his statistics and brings his figures to life. He draws, too, both from his own experiences in China in 1932 and the experiences of personal friends who have spent many years there, the inevitable, but nonetheless striking contrasts between the nightmare horrors of the recent past and the cheerful realities of the present. But the sections of the book which most people will read with greatest interest are those dealing with the Dean's personal meetings when he was in China last year—his conversations with leaders of the Christian churches, who frankly explained the imperialist role played by many foreign missionaries in the past, and his meetings with Mao Tse-tung, Chou En-lai and other leading personalities, as well as with workers and peasants in different parts of China. I wish, and I imagine many other readers will agree, that he had been able to find more room for his personal experiences during his journey.

I wish, too, that he had found space to deal more fully with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ideological foundations of New China, and the close relationship that exists in every sphere between theory and practice. The last section of the book, which summarises the history of the liberation and deals with the application of Marxism to Chinese problems and with the development of the 'new morality' is unsatisfyingly brief.

However, the book's great merit is that on every topic—both those dealt with fully as well as those which are only touched on briefly—is that it sharpens the reader's appetite to know more. Its warmth and humanity and its wealth of concrete detail combine to make it an admirable introduction to a whole range of subjects about which most people—perhaps not altogether inexcusably—are still very badly informed. A great deal of it takes the reader beyond the stage of introduction to a sense of real understanding both of the individual and of the problems which new China is solving with such dramatic success. Mrs. Hewlett Johnson's skilful and loving drawings add to the charm of a book which will make many friends.

MONICA FELTON

ON KOJE ISLAND

Koje Unscreened, by Wilfred Burchett and Alan Winnington. (Published by the Authors, Box 545, Peking, China, 174 pp. *1s.*).

THIS book is written by two journalists who have worked in Korea during most of the Korean war. To them we owe admiration for their courage and resource, and gratitude not only for the information which they have given the world directly but also for that which their mere existence has compelled the Americans who use the name of the United Nations to give from time to time, however untruthfully, belatedly, or partially.

The book contains an exposure of the endless cruelties inflicted by the Americans, in violation of the Geneva Convention and of every dictate of humanity, upon large numbers of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war on Koje Island. The object of the writers is not merely to expose and record these brutalities but also to demonstrate the complete unreliability of the methods employed by the Americans to collect statistics of the prisoners whom they describe as 'unwilling to be repatriated'.

Evidence of atrocities is often unreliable; but here the authors have had the advantage of interviewing many escaped prisoners and quite a few more who surrendered or were captured after being dropped in North Korea for espionage purposes by the Americans. They have in addition corroboration from members of the Canadian Forces who were present at some of the atrocities; and the American authorities have themselves reported a great many killings and injuries they have themselves inflicted on prisoners. The International Committee of the Red Cross, a somewhat right-wing body, has also sent reports of what it has been allowed to see, which are enough to condemn the Americans pretty fully. Finally the whole incident of the capture of General Dodd by the prisoners, with the statements made by the Americans and their promises of better behaviour for the future, provides corroboration of the highest quality.

On my estimate of the evidence the story must be broadly true, and I do not think it loses value, even in relation to its exposure of the story of 'resistance to repatriation', through the concessions recently made by the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

North Koreans and Chinese on the application of the principle of repatriation. It stands as a permanent record of the vileness of rulers who have no culture, no principles but power and profit, no political basis beyond selfishness and blind panic in the face of 'Communism'—a label which they apply to every healthy and decent reaction created by their own vileness—and no capacity to understand that 'coloured' people are human. It records, too, unhappily, that ordinary youths, fed by these rulers on their own fears, with their education corrupted by 'comics' and Hollywood, can be made to behave as vilely as their rulers desire.

The exposure of the farce of 'screening' (itself in any case illegal) which had already been pretty well exposed on the basis of the admissions and contradictory statements made by the Americans, is made splendidly complete by the book's description of the methods used to extract the 'consents' on which the Americans—who have killed without military reasons a greater percentage of the population of Korea than even Hitler murdered anywhere — now base their hypocritical 'humanitarian' reluctance to return prisoners to their own countries, as the Geneva Convention clearly ordains that they should. There is also an interesting disclosure that a decision to refuse the repatriation of large numbers of prisoners for propaganda purposes was made less than a week before the 'cease-fire' talks began in 1951!

Another useful chapter in the book shows how, in the long negotiations in Geneva which led up to the 1949 Convention, proposals for allowing prisoners to refuse repatriation were discussed and definitely rejected just because they might lead to abuses of the type the Americans have been committing on Koje Island. And yet another gives a description of the good treatment given by the Koreans and Chinese to prisoners of war in their hands.

What conclusions should we draw from this book? One, I think, is of the urgency and importance of re-establishing the observance of international law. Almost every line of this book shows how the Americans have violated a Convention deliberately accepted by them in 1949, and enshrining centuries of development of the protection of prisoners. They promised, in that Convention, to treat prisoners humanely, to apply to them no violence, murder, cruelty, or torture, nor any violation of personal dignity, to exercise no discrimination based on political opinions, to use no physical or mental torture or any form of coercion to secure information of any kind from them, nor to threaten or insult them for refusing to answer; and not to use weapons against them even when they attempted to escape, save as an extreme measure and only then after warning. All these provisions, and more, have been systematically violated.

Our next conclusion must be that those guilty of these operations must be tried for war crimes.

But there is more. We must condemn the inert rôle of our own government, and insist that it protests against such barbarism, and demands that the Panmunjom negotiations be taken out of military hands, and that British representatives with some courage and moral standards—not just 'Yeah-men'—take part in these and in all further negotiations, lest the barbarians, who can neither conduct a war or be solvent in peace, continue to sabotage the negotiations to save their own position.

D. N. PRITT.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PARIS COMMUNE

The Revolutionary Movement in France, by John Plamenatz, Fellow of Nuffield College, Oxford. (184 pp. Longmans. *16s.*).

KARL MARX wrote, in *The Civil War in France*: 'Working-men's Paris, with its Commune, shall be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which not all the prayers of their priests will avail to redeem them'.

The first purpose of Mr. Plamenatz's book is to succeed where the priests have failed; he sets out to redeem the exterminators of the Paris Commune of 1871, to redeem the men who first showed the world the ferocity of capitalists confronted with a workers' government.

The world historic significance of the Commune lay in its development of a form of democracy which was a whole epoch in advance of the most democratic form of capitalist rule, the constitutional republic. The experience of the Commune not only showed that the constitutional republic was out-moded, it exposed the humbug of the middle-class republicans, for they established their regime only after resorting to a terror that made the worst atrocities of the Napoleon III Second Empire pale into insignificance. Established by anti-popular violence and ignoble intrigue, the bourgeois republic was born as it died, in national humiliation. It was the glory of the Commune that it swept away the standing army, the police force, the whole of the old bureaucratic apparatus, and concentrated power in the hands of the proletariat. In short, it established those conditions which history has subsequently shown to have been imperative, not only for the emancipation of the working class, but also for the regeneration of France, whose bourgeois army and officials have continually menaced her liberties without securing her national independence.

Mr. Plamenatz tries to obscure all this; he tries to show that the Third Republic was the outcome of a movement that was still vital and progressive. To make this plausible he fastens on the old forms of organisation and thought which encumbered the essentially modern and advanced character of the Commune, he tries to make it appear as if the Commune was a last convulsion of the old Revolution rather than the first thunder clap of the new. But the Parisian proletariat was not merely reiterating the Jacobinism of its forefathers of 1791—only a bourgeois historian could live eighty years to so little purpose. The Commune was a dictatorship, not of the petit-bourgeoisie, but of the proletariat. Similarly, the Republican tradition, which Mr. Plamenatz sees as triumphant in 1871, is no more the same as that which lived and moved in 1791 than Eisenhower is the heir to the tradition of Abraham Lincoln.

The second purpose of Mr. Plamenatz's book, inseparably connected with the first, is to discredit what he takes to be the Marxist interpretation of French history. Plamenatz recognises that the experience of the French revolutionary movement is a component source of Marxism and he acknowledges that Marx was a shrewd observer of French politics. Having admitted that classes have interests and that the stuff of politics is 'largely' class-struggle, Mr. Plamenatz, with a logic that is as impeccable as the resort to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is desperate, points out that it does not follow that these struggles are about these interests, (page 169). The struggles might be unhappy mistakes, traditional feuds and enmities and this is just what they turn out to be on Mr. Plamenatz's hill-billy interpretation of history. If we will look at the social cause of political conflicts we will find that they can all be settled peacefully, according to Mr. Plamenatz, but this is an article of faith for which no evidence is presented.

In the brilliant opening passages of the *Eighteenth Brumaire* Marx states that proletarian revolutions 'criticise themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their own course . . . recoil ever and anon from the indefinite prodigiousness of their own aims. . . .' Mr. Plamenatz is incapable of interpreting this in terms of the detailed theoretical and organisational development of the proletariat, for him it is merely German metaphysical mumbo-jumbo. But the reader pays a high price for Mr. Plamenatz's English 'common-sense'; he finds it 'impossible to say' what the Parisian proletariat hoped to gain by fighting in June, 1848, and as already noted, the significance of the Commune is completely obscured.

In his anxiety not to be confused with the cosmopolitan ragamuffins of the Arthur Koestler variety, Mr. Plamenatz comes close to caricaturing the 'English' tradition to which he is so attached. His advocacy of timely concessions without regard for the economic differences between France and England in the nineteenth century and his suggestion that Marx was silly to censure the Commune for not taking over the Bank of France when, after all, it could borrow from it, are extrava-

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

ESTABLISHED 1936

Volume XVII, Number 2

Spring, 1953

The Social Content of Science Fiction

Oscar Shaftel

* * *

Trade Unionism in the United States and Australia: A Study in Contrasts

Lloyd G. Churchward

* * *

The Opposition of French Labor to American Slavery

Samuel Bernstein

* * *

Comment on H. K. Takahashi's "Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism"

Maurice Dobb

Paul M. Sweezy

* * *

Book Reviews by

Miguel Silva, E. H. S. Burhop, Frederic Schoenfeld, Butler A. Jones, A. L. Morton, Christopher Hill, Charles A. Madison, Richard Greenleaf, Ronald L. Meek

* * *

Quarterly, 50 cents Single Copy
$2.00 per year ($2.50 foreign)

SCIENCE & SOCIETY, Inc.

30, East 20th St., New York 3, N.Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gances even by the standards of the most insular British empiricism.

Lastly, as a comment on the vanity of going 'beyond' the class struggle, it should be noted that Mr. Plamenatz uses the word 'crowd' when the Parisian proletariat is making a bourgeois revolution and 'mob' when it is acting on its own account. (Compare page 133, 'The crowd invaded the legislature', with page 139 'they could deliberate without fear of the mob'.)

H.R.J.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

Who Killed Kenya? by Colin Wills. Dennis Dobson. 112 pp. 9s. 6d.
Defiant People; Drawings of Greece Today, by Paul Hogarth. Lawrence & Wishart. 42 pp. 6s.
Alitet Goes to the Hills. Tikhon Syomushkin. Russia Today Book Club. 596 pp. 3s.
Marginal Land in Britain. Professor W. Ellison. Geoffrey Bles. 224 pp. 25s.
J. V. Stalin. Collected Works, Vol. I. Lawrence & Wishart. 426 pp. 5s.
We Too Can Prosper, by Graham Hutton. Allen & Unwin. 248 pp. 12s.

PAMPHLETS

The Webbs in Perspective. R. H. Tawney. University of London. 22 pp. 2s. 6d.
In China Now. Peter Townsend. Union of Democratic Control. 32 pp. 1s. 6d.

CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS NUMBERS IN 1953

JANUARY: *Twenty Years On*, R.P.D.; *Trade Unionism in* 1953, Peter Kerrigan; *Africa in Ferment*, Desmond Buckle; *Impressions of China: New Democracy*, Benjamin Farrington; *The Forrestal Diaries*, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; *People's Democracy in Countries of the East, I*; BOOK REVIEWS: *Introduction to Marxism* (Emile Burns); *Readers' Guide to the Marxist Classics; China Today* (Sundar Lal) reviewed by James Klugmann, W. J. Ellerby; *Drawings*, Mazzullo.

FEBRUARY: *Churchill, Eisenhower and Britain*, R.P.D.; *The Geneva Convention*, 1949, J. Platts-Mills; *At Vienna I Saw Peace*, Jean-Paul Sartre; *The Rents Offensive*, Katherine Hood; *People's Democracy in Countries of the East, II*; *A New Town in Poland*, George Bidwell; BOOK REVIEWS: *U.S. Foreign Policy* (Walter Lippmann); *The Critical Years* (G. Von Schweppenburg); *Economics of Peace and War* (John Eaton); *Plot Against Peace* (Ivor Montagu); reviewed by Andrew Rothstein, Henry Purcell, Stanley Evans.

MARCH: (Marx 70th Anniversary Number): *Marxism After* 70 *Years*, R.P.D.; *The Great Discussion*, George Matthews; *On a U.S. Ambassador*, Karl Marx; *Zionism*, Andrew Rothstein; *Impressions of China: Education*, Benjamin Farrington; *Trials and the Press*, Pat Sloan; *People's Democracy in Countries of the East, III*; *Facsimile*: The Minutes of the First International, May 23, 1871.

APRIL (Stalin Memorial Number): *Stalin and the Future*, R.P.D.; *Tributes to Stalin*, I J. Nehru, II D. N. Pritt, Q.C., III William Gallacher; *Stalin's Legacy*, James Klugmann; *The General Strike*, 1926, J. V. Stalin; *Mr. Eden Kow-Tows*, Quæstor; *Cold War Against Britain*, Cmdr. E. P. Young, R.N. (Ret'd.); BOOK REVIEWS: *America Over Britain* (P. Bolsover); *Brother Bill McKie*, (Philip Bonsky); *Quakers Visit Russia* (Kathleen Lonsdale, F.R.S.); *England in the Late Middle Ages* (A. R. Myers); *England in the 17th Century* (M. Ashley); reviewed by J. B. Figgins, W. Gallacher, A.R., L. F. Marks, A.L.M.

MAY: *D-Day for Peace*, R.P.D.; *May Day and the Fight for Peace*, J. B. Figgins; *Calendar of Peace Moves*, Quæstor; *Francois Rabelais*, T. A. Jackson; *Violence in America*, George Hardy; *An Epic Story*, William Gallacher; *The General Strike*, 1926 (II), J. V. Stalin; BOOK REVIEWS: *That's Why I Went* (Monica Felton); *Betrayed Spring* (Jack Lindsay); *Problems of Nationalized Industry* (W. A. Robson); *Rumanian Summer* (J. Lindsay and M. Cornforth); *Not Like This* (Jane Walsh); *Sociology of Communism* (J. Monnerot); reviewed by D. N. Pritt, Q.C., J. Mahon, W. Hannington, P.J.W., B. Marks, T.A.J.

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Awake, ye sons of toil! nor sleep
While millions starve, while millions weep.
Demand your right; let tyrants see
You are resolved that you'll be free!

Those could be words sung by Africans, Malayans and other colonial peoples rising from their knees—and far nearer home, by the 'natives' of Burton-wood; but in fact the words were sung a hundred years ago by Chartist textile strikers in Lancashire. Indeed, there are the makings of one great family of peoples—but not in the sense of the 'vulgar tomfoolery' which William Morris described so vigorously in *An Old Superstition; a New Disgrace* which we print on page 271. Among the May Day greetings to be passed on to our readers is one from a part of the world where millions no longer starve or weep. A scarlet and gold card comes wishing us and all readers fraternal greetings and hopes for 'the further strengthening of friend-ship and unity between the working class of our two countries and greater successes in the struggle for world peace'. It is from the All-China Federa-tion of Labour. If readers receive this number of *L.M.* with enthusiasm—which I believe they will—I hope that they will not keep their enthusiasm to themselves. We are cheerfully looking forward to being over-worked with requests for extra copies, and for specimen copies to be forwarded to friends and workmates (see back cover for specimen copy form).

P.S. In reply to those who so much admired the portrait of Stalin in the April issue, we have had a few mounted and framed. Post free, 5s.

No space is left to discuss the fund—but note the April total has fallen too low—except to draw attention to the American reader who sends a donation with this cheerful message to his English neighbour in the list 'Hi! Socialist Sailor!'

£32 6s. 9d.

STAND-IN MONEY came from: 'Billie', standing-in for Tonypandy, 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.

STEADY MONEY came from: Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s.; C.B., 'Bristol', 3s.; 'Cardiff', £2; J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; P.O'H., 'Dublin', 2s.; 'Chicago', £1 8s.; J.F., 'Aberdeen' (pre-paid); A.G., 'Arbroath' (pre-paid); 'New York' (pre-paid); 'Overseas Airman', 5s.; 'Red Sergeant', 2s. 6d.; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; 'Hi! Socialist Sailor!' (U.S.A.), £1 17s.; E. D. McCallum (pre-paid); D. Rees (pre-paid); Tam O'Shanter and Grey Mare (pre-paid); H.G.B., 2s.; Q. Elliott, 6s.; R. McLeod, £1; Royston Green, 3s. 6d.; 'Jon', 5s.; M. Philibert, 10s.; 'Cambridge Seniors', 15s.; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; R.F.B., £3; Bob Waters, 3s.; L'Humanite, 3s.; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 5s.; S. Morrissy, 10s.; H. Tinkler, 5s.; D. M. Clarke, 10s.; E.J.B., 10s.; D.M., 6s.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.; Olivia Greene, £2.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: D. M. Adams, 2s.; B. Brain, 7s.; D.H. (U.S.A.), £2 5s. 9d.; A. J. Salmon, 1s.; C. F. L. Hill, 7s.; T. Bernstein, 2s.; Rutland Boughton, £3 14s. 6d.; I. Inyang, 6d.; R. M. Lang, 12s.; M. Hurwitt, £1 1s.; A. S. Garrido, 2s.; T. Hanson, 2s.; H.M.McC., 2s.; T. Madhoji, 5s.; R. A. Mowat, 5s.; H. Calcutt, 12s.; J. Fergusson, 6s.; W. J. Morris, 2s. 6d.; J. W. Railly, 1s.; H. Sutcliffe, 5s.; J. G. Chelsom, 2s.; C. Dodsworth, 2s.; 'New Zealander', £1 1s.; M. Nathan, 2s.; A. Opulski, 2s.; C. and P. Freeman, 2s.; J. Smith, 3s.; K. Y. Rintoul, 5s.; N. Hamlin, 2s.; H. Whiteley, 2s.; A. Hacking, 2s.; Mrs. M. Paton, 7s.

Our thanks to you all.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Co-op. No.: L99482.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

Here's the Subscription Form:

NAME.....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS.....

.....

.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber and enclose 18s. (home) $3.00 (U.S.A. and Canada), 19s. (elsewhere) for a year, beginning with the.....issue.

(SIGNED).....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Labour Monthly Bound Volume 1952

It's a history of the year and a permanent record

ORDER NOW

From your usual newsagents price **£1 5s. 0d.**, or

THE MANAGER
134, BALLARDS LANE
LONDON, N.3

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

The Progressive Newsweekly

Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

Annual Subscription 24s.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1.

LABOUR RESEARCH

June issue includes:

"China: Background to the Five Year Plan"
"Coal Board Reports"
"Profits in Engineering"

Monthly 9d.; p.a., 10s. 6d.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy to:—

(1) Name .....
Address.....

(2) Name .....
Address.....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed.....
Address .....
.....

TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED